



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*romanische und englische Sprache und Literatur*, vol. XIV, p. 453; the second extract is credited to the edition of the *Cortesano* in *Coleccion de libros españoles raros ó curiosos*, vol. VII, Madrid, 1874. Now instead of correcting his texts by the Madrid edition in both cases, Papini actually reprints the version in the *Jahrbuch* with its incredible blunders (e. g., *inhadado testo* for *enhadado desto*, *vyese* for *oyese*, etc.), and has added some of his own, such as the omission of *no* before *le podian hallar*, which of course spoils the point of the story. In almost every case in this extract the accents are wrong. In the extract credited to the Madrid edition there are only five misprints, none of them very bad, e. g., *may* for *muy*, *senor* for *señor*, *è* for *e*, etc.

Even where Papini has a good text before him he is apparently unable to reproduce it correctly: in an extract from Filelfo (Solerti, p. 175, Papini, p. 38), *nec vellet peccare* becomes *nes vel et peccare*; wrong divisions are constant, e. g., p. 55, *adalte-ram*, p. 81, *curante* for *cur ante*, p. 95, *sudort antus*, etc. How could Papini overlook such a misprint as *qui-buasdā*, p. 91, or constantly quote Petrarch's work under the impossible form *De rerum memorandarum*? Mistakes in proper names are not common, but I have noted, p. 78, Godwin for Gladwin (the correct form occurs on p. 84, so there are two entries in the index), Ginfà for Giufà, p. 104, Geffchen for Geffcken. I have no space left to mention the errors in the English extracts, but I must not overlook *loud* for *lond* in Gower, p. 58.

Finally, there is something to criticize even in the frontispiece. The statement is "Ritratto di Dante attribuito a Raffaello esistente in Monaco." I cannot find that this portrait (first reproduced in the *Jahrbuch der deutschen Dante-Gesellschaft*, vol. II, 1869) has ever been attributed to others than Masaccio and Ghirlandajo, see R. T. Holbrook's *Portraits of Dante from Giotto to Raffael*, p. 8, the portrait faces p. 10.

T. F. CRANE.

Cornell University.

*Deutsche Schrifttafeln* des IX. bis XVI. Jahrhunderts aus Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München. Herausgegeben von ERICH PETZET und OTTO GLAUNING. I. Abteilung. Althochdeutsche Schrift Denkmäler des IX. bis XI. Jahrhunderts. München: Druck u. Verlag von Carl Kuhn, 1910. Fol.

This is the first number of a collection of collotype facsimiles from German manuscripts, intended to illustrate the development of writing in Germany from the earliest period to the time when printed books took the place of written codices. The whole series is to consist of five numbers, published at the price of M. 7.— (or in cloth binding M. 8.—) for each number. The specimens have been selected in every instance from manuscripts of the Royal Library in Munich.

The scope of the first number is not—as one might suppose from the title—strictly confined to Old High German, since it includes a specimen of the cod. Monacensis of the Heliand (pl. VII). Among the Old High German texts represented in this number the best known probably are: the Wessobrunn Prayer (pl. I, the entire poem), the Muspilli (pl. VI), Otfrid (pl. VIII, last page of the Freisingen ms.), and Williram's Paraphrase of the Song of Solomon (pl. XV, first page of the Ebersburg ms.). In addition to these, facsimiles are given of the 'Exhortatio ad plebem christianam' (pl. II), the Freisingen Paternoster (pl. III, two different versions), the Franconian Prayer (pl. IV), the 'Carmen ad Deum' (pl. V), the Song in praise of St. Peter (pl. IX), the Augsburg Prayer (pl. X), two specimens of OHG. Glossaries (pl. XI and XII), Otloh's Prayer (pl. XIII), and the Munich fragment of Notker's Psalms (pl. XIV).

Several of these facsimiles, to be sure, are accessible in other works (e. g. plates I, II, III<sup>b</sup>, IV, VI, VIII, IX, in M. Enneccerus, *Die ältesten deutschen Sprachdenkmäler*, Frankfurt a. M., 1897; pl. XV in W. Walther, *Die deutsche Bibelübersetzung des Mittelalters*, etc.). The

present publication, however, has distinctive features of its own, apt to lend to it special value as an introduction to the study of German paleography. Not only is every plate accompanied by a literal translation of the text, but also by a brief paleographical commentary in which both the general form of the writing and the special peculiarities of each specimen are carefully characterized. The technical execution of the plates is excellent, the price moderate. The work as a whole fully answers the purpose for which it was undertaken, *i. e.*, to serve as a practical aid, accessible not only to larger libraries but to every student of Germanic philology.

A word must be added in regard to the transcriptions. These are on the whole quite accurate, in fact more so than the texts given in OHG. Readers and in philological works generally. In one respect, however, *viz.*, so far as the separation of words is concerned, no attempt has been made to render the originals faithfully. Here, instead of retaining the individual method of each scribe, the modern system of word separation has been adopted throughout. If this had been done for merely practical purposes, it might be regarded as entirely proper, the more so as it is in keeping with the usual practice of modern philologists. Obviously, however, the editors have failed to recognize that the system followed in many of the early texts differs in principle from the one to which we are accustomed. Otherwise they would not have made statements like the following: "Die Worttrennung ist in B weniger gelungen als in A" (expl. to pl. III., Freisingen Paternoster); "Worttrennung wird angestrebt" (pl. VIII., Otfrid); "Die Worttrennung ist noch unvollkommen" (pl. x, Augsburger Gebet). This sounds as if the scribes had intended to write, in accordance with our modern practice, each word separately, yet had not quite succeeded in carrying out their aim. The fact, however, is that the scribes endeavored not to separate words held together by one and the same stress accent.

This is most clearly seen in cases where an unaccented preposition is combined with the

following noun or adjective or pronoun. *E. g.*, in the passage from Otfrid (pl. VIII) *mit selbon chriftes seganon* (l. 2), *ingihugti* (l. 3), *mituuortun* (l. 4), *zitruchtine* (ib.), *indemo frifte* (l. 5), *ziuuallentemo krfiste* (ib.), *ziuuallenteru henti* (l. 6), *inerdu ioh inhimile* (ll. 9 and 17), *mitengilon* (ll. 10 and 18), etc. The same principle is followed—though less systematically—by the scribe of the Heliand (pl. VII), *e. g.*, *anthat gibirgi* (l. 2), *anfiod* (l. 11), *anthemu see* (l. 18), *antheu fiod* (l. 29), *anforhtun* (l. 21).

A lack of ability, on part of the scribes, to recognize the preposition as an individual word, follows from instances of this kind as little as it does for Modern German from the recent official (or semi-official) spellings like *im-stande sein*, *zustande bringen*, *zugrunde gehen*, *vonnöten sein*, etc. The difference between the modern usage and that of the Old German scribes rests on the fact that at present the combination of the preposition with the following noun is restricted to instances in which the noun is used adverbially, while in the Old High German period the similar spelling was based not on syntactical but merely on phonetic reasons.

That indeed in instances like those quoted above the accent is the decisive factor, is confirmed by the fact that words consisting of two elements each of which has a separate accent, are spelled as two separate words. *E. g.*, the compounds given in Petzet's and Glauning's transcriptions as *liuduueroð* (Heliand, l. 2), *seolidandean* (ib., l. 10), *lagulidandea* (l. 16), *modsebo* (l. 21), in *abgrunte* (Otfrid, l. 9) appear in the MSS. as *liud uueroð*, *seo lidandean*, *lagu lidandea*, *mod sebo*, *inab grunte*.

It is clear then that in order to do justice to the scribes we must not judge their method by our modern standard, but must attempt to ascertain their own principles and to trace the development of the various methods used in different localities and at different periods.

With few exceptions (*e. g.*, G. A. Hench in his edition of the *Monsee Fragments*, Strassburg, 1891), the editors of OHG. texts have not considered it worth while to pay any attention

in their texts or their critical apparatus to the practice of word separation in the original texts. It is therefore only by the aid of manuscripts or of facsimiles that this subject—and similar ones—can be studied, and it is much to be desired that the example given by G. A. Hench in his facsimile edition of the OHG. Isidor should be more frequently followed.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

Johns Hopkins University.

### MODERN FRENCH POETS

A. VAN BEVER et P. LÉAUTAUD : *Poètes d'aujourd'hui*. Morceaux choisis accompagnés de notices biographiques et d'un essai de bibliographie. 20<sup>e</sup> édition. 2 vols. Paris : Mercure de France, 1910. 358 and 373 pp.

A. VAN BEVER : *Les poètes du terroir du XV<sup>e</sup> au XX<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Textes choisis, etc. Tome II : *Dauphiné, Flandre, Franche-Comté, Gascogne et Guyenne, Ile-de-France, Limousin*. Tome III : *Languedoc et Comté de Foix, Lorraine, Lyonnais, Nivernais, Normandie*. Paris : Delagrave, n. d. 346 and 350 pp.

F.-A. CAZALS et G. LE ROUGE : *Les derniers jours de Verlaine*, avec une préface de Maurice Barrès. Paris : Mercure de France, 1911. x, 270 pp.

E. DE ROUGEMONT : *Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, biographie et bibliographie*, etc. Paris : Mercure de France, 1910. 413 pp.

STEFAN ZWEIF : *Emile Verhaeren, sa vie, son œuvre*. Traduit de l'allemand. Paris : Mercure de France, 1910. 350 pp.

MARCEL COULON : *Témoignages* (Moréas, A. France, R. de Gourmont). Paris : Mercure de France, 1910. 298 pp.

EDMOND ROSTAND : *Les Musardises*. Edition nouvelle 1887-1893. 9<sup>e</sup> mille. Paris : Charpentier et Fasquelle, 1911. viii, 292 pp.

France is to-day almost the only country in which poetry still occupies an important place in

literature. The output, therefore, both of verse and of critical studies is comparatively large. The following is an attempt at a rapid survey of some of the more interesting publications in this field during the last two years.

Let us first of all welcome the twentieth edition of Van Bever and Léautaud's *Poètes d'aujourd'hui*, now published in two volumes. Unlike other works of a similar character, *e. g.*, Brümmer's *Lexikon der deutschen Dichter und Prosaisten des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, this anthology will appeal not only to those professionally interested, but also to the literary public at large. Specimens of the verse of the writers mentioned are given in every case. Accurate and suggestive information is furnished in the introductory notes, some of which have in their brief compass the substance of essays (R. de Gourmont, Comtesse de Noailles, Mallarmé). They contain much information not to be found elsewhere, drawn from personal acquaintance with the authors, and often indispensable to an intelligent reading of their poems (Merrill, Fort).

The same indefatigable Van Bever has published two more volumes of his *Poètes du terroir*. As the first volume has already been reviewed in *Modern Language Notes* (December, 1909), all that needs be said is that the work continues to present the same interest. The European press, sceptical or indifferent toward the first volume, has now almost completely changed its attitude.

On reading the new volume on Verlaine, containing such chapters as "Les dernières Maîtresses," "Verlaine au Café," "Verlaine amusant," the reviewer was at first disposed to question the biographer's defence: "N'est-ce pas servir la gloire du génial poète que de dire toute la vérité sur ce pénible sujet?" (p. 83). One must confess, however, that in Verlaine's case—as in Villon's, or even Musset's—such revelations are essential to a real understanding of the poet. The delicate subject, which mere erudition would have rendered repulsive, has been handled with a tact that saves the situation. The book is a useful complement to Lepelletier's *Paul Verlaine, sa vie, son œuvre* (1907), and is besides a valuable guide for one who wishes to understand the Latin Quarter of the poets.

E. de Rougemont's recent work on Villiers de